

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

James Pintar, et al.,

## Plaintiffs

V.

CSAA General Insurance Company, et al.,

## Defendants

Case No. 2:21-cv-00652-CDS-EJY

## Order Rejecting Proposed Joint Pretrial Order

[ECF No. 45]

10 This is a breach of insurance contract case. The parties filed a proposed joint pretrial  
11 order. ECF No. 45. For the following reasons, the joint pretrial order does not comply with Local  
12 Rules (LR) 16-3 and 16-4, thus I reject it.

13 First, based on the consecutive Bates numbering, plaintiffs appear to list every document  
14 produced in this case for their trial exhibits. ECF No. 45 at 3–5. Local Rule 16-3(b)(8) requires  
15 parties to list the “exhibits that will be offered in evidence by the parties at the trial.” Listing  
16 every document with no attempt to cull does not satisfy this rule. Nor is it permissible to  
17 include the catch-all of “Plaintiffs[ ] Responses to Defendant’s [First, Second, Third] Set of  
18 Request for Documents” as defendants have done here. *Id.* at 6. If what defendants mean is every  
19 single document that plaintiffs identified in response to their document requests, this is  
20 noncompliant. Again, under LR 16-3(b)(8), not only must the list include only the exhibits that  
21 will be offered at trial, but those exhibits must be described “sufficiently for ready  
22 identification[.]”

23 Both sides also incorrectly attempt to reserve their right to object to the other side's  
24 exhibits. *Id.* at 7. No such right exists. Local Rule 16-3(b)(8)(B) requires the parties to state the  
25 grounds for each objection to each specific exhibit.

1 In addition, defendants seem to identify every person who has been identified in  
2 discovery, without any analysis as to whether those witnesses are truly needed at trial. *Id.* at 7–9.  
3 It would be impossible to present 36 witnesses in a four-day trial as the parties have requested.

4 While the parties are not required to list only those exhibits and witnesses that they are  
5 sure to offer at trial, they cannot simply list every document and person identified in discovery.  
6 The purpose behind the joint pretrial order is to streamline trial preparation and the  
7 presentation of evidence.

8 **Conclusion**

9 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the parties' proposed joint pretrial order [ECF No.  
10 45] is REJECTED. The parties must confer and submit a second proposed joint pretrial order by  
11 March 12, 2024.

12 Dated: February 28, 2024

13   
14 Cristina D. Silva  
United States District Judge

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26